United Nations E/AC.51/2013/5

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
25 March 2013

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
Substantive session, 3-28 June 2013
Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Programme questions: evaluation

Review of the evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

Summary

The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) identified the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for evaluation based on a risk assessment carried out in 2008. The Committee for Programme and Coordination selected the programme evaluation of UNHCR for consideration at its fifty-third session in June 2013 (see A/66/16, para. 66). The General Assembly endorsed the selection in its resolution 66/8 (see para. 6).

Following consultations and discussions with UNHCR senior management and building from recent findings emanating from the Board of Auditors and external reviews, it was agreed that it would be more timely and useful to conduct a review of the evaluation capacity of UNHCR before undertaking an evaluation of the programme.

The purpose of the OIOS review was to assess the current evaluation capacity in UNHCR and determine how it could be improved to better contribute to organizational results, learning and accountability. It used quantitative and qualitative methods, including a document review, interviews, surveys, a field mission and a meta-evaluation of UNHCR evaluation reports.

* E/AC.51/2013/1.

13-26973 (E) 100413

Please recycle

The evaluation function in UNHCR has not been clearly defined. While the current evaluation policy uses the basic definition of evaluation as endorsed by the United Nations Evaluation Group, it does not adequately articulate a clear and distinct role for the function nor link evaluation explicitly to the mandates, goals and strategic priorities of UNHCR. An assessment of the 28 reports from 2010 and 2011 labelled as UNHCR evaluation reports on the Policy Development and Evaluation Service website were in fact a mixture of evaluations, policy papers, think pieces and academic research papers. In addition, dedicated resources for the evaluation function, as part of the overall UNHCR budget, have been low.

Nevertheless, the work of the Policy Development and Evaluation Service, which is currently tasked with undertaking evaluation in UNHCR, has served a useful purpose, given its mandate and resources. It has maintained a high level of productivity with just five staff and a limited consultancy budget for conducting evaluations. In general, feedback from UNHCR stakeholders with regard to the information the Service provides on policy matters has been positive.

The current evaluation function also does not fully meet the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group for evaluation independence, credibility and utility. The function has limited independence given its placement within a section that simultaneously undertakes policy development and research, and evaluation has dual reporting lines to the High Commissioner and Deputy High Commissioner, although both are in the Executive Office. The work-planning process is largely demand-driven and is not based on an assessment of organizational risks, and the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme does not review or discuss individual evaluation reports, although many members surveyed suggested they would like to do so.

Furthermore, the credibility of the evaluation function of UNHCR is constrained by methodological limitations in assessing organizational results. Stakeholders reported insufficient evaluation of UNHCR performance and impact in respect of all aspects of its mandate, including both its protection and programme work, with little evaluative evidence available for strategic decision-making. Also, with the exception of the Head of the Policy Development and Evaluation Service, staff responsible for evaluation are not required to have evaluation experience or technical competencies. Regular and systematic follow-up processes for discussing evaluation results and tracking evaluation recommendations have been lacking, which has further limited the utility of evaluation in UNHCR.

Unlike other United Nations entities with a strong field presence, UNHCR does not have a functional centralized and decentralized evaluation structure, and there is limited evaluative evidence on UNHCR country programme performance. In other United Nations entities with a strong field presence, centralized evaluation addresses organization-wide strategic issues and is usually carried out independently from those responsible for programme operations and the results evaluated. Decentralized evaluation, on the other hand, has a more narrow scope and is typically embedded within programme operations. While it is already doing this to some extent, UNHCR can utilize existing resources and activities within the Division of Programme Support and Management and the Division of International Protection more strategically in order to systematize and regularize its decentralized evaluation.

OIOS made the following five important recommendations, with which UNHCR agreed or partially agreed:

- Establish a dedicated and discrete evaluation unit at headquarters with responsibility for conducting programmatic and cross-cutting strategic evaluations of UNHCR
- Revise the UNHCR evaluation policy
- Strengthen the rigour and utility of UNHCR programme evaluations
- Develop a regular and systematic process for follow-up to evaluation recommendations
- Develop a strategy for strengthening decentralized evaluation in the field

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	4
II.	Scope and methodology	4
III.	Background	5
IV.	Evaluation in the United Nations system	6
V.	Review results	7
	A. Lack of clear definition of the evaluation function in the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	7
	B. Current evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: key United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for independence, credibility and utility not fully met	9
	C. Lack of a functional centralized and decentralized evaluation system common to other United Nations entities with a strong field presence	14
VI.	Conclusion	17
VII.	Recommendations	18
Annex		
	Memorandum dated 20 March 2013 from the Deputy High Commissioner of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees addressed to the Inspection and Evaluation Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services	21

I. Introduction

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) identified the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for evaluation based on a risk assessment carried out in 2008. The Committee for Programme and Coordination selected the programme evaluation of UNHCR for consideration at its fifty-third session in June 2013 (see A/66/16, para. 61). The General Assembly endorsed the selection in its resolution 66/8 (see para. 6).

2. Following consultations and discussions with UNHCR senior management and building from recent findings emanating from the Board of Auditors and external reviews, it was agreed that it would be more timely and useful at this juncture to conduct a review of the evaluation capacity of UNHCR before undertaking an evaluation of the programme.

3. The purpose of this review was to:

(a) Assess the current evaluation capacity in UNHCR; and

(b) Determine how it could be improved to better contribute to organizational results, learning and accountability.

II. Scope and methodology

4. OIOS undertook the review from June to December 2012. It was not a comprehensive programme evaluation, and the review followed terms of reference agreed to by both OIOS and UNHCR. While appreciating that evaluation and policy development in UNHCR are integrated, as per the decision of successive High Commissioners since 1999, OIOS limited its review to the UNHCR evaluation function only. In the present report, OIOS refers to "programme evaluation" as encompassing the full range of the UNHCR mandate, including protection, solutions and assistance activities within a given country operation. This would include evaluation at the country, regional and global levels.

5. In assessing evaluation capacity at UNHCR, OIOS utilized methodology endorsed by the United Nations Evaluation Group, of which UNHCR is a member. This methodology was developed for the Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function in United Nations Organizations and is derived from three criteria based on the Group's norms and standards for evaluation:[1]

(a) Independence, which determines the impartiality of evaluations;

(b) Credibility, which explores the relevance and effectiveness of evaluations by focusing on the quality, methodological rigour, transparency and consultative nature; and

(c) Utility, which covers the relevance, use and cost of evaluation products.

[1] See United Nations Evaluation Group Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function of UN Organizations, UNEG/REF(2011)1.

6. The review used the following quantitative and qualitative data-collection methods:

(a) A critical review of relevant documentation, including United Nations internal and public documents and external literature on UNHCR and its evaluation function;

(b) An electronic, self-administered survey of a non-random sample of 12 country offices. The survey was conducted in November 2012, and nine offices responded (a 75 per cent response rate);[2]

(c) An electronic, self-administered survey of all 87 members of the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme. The survey was conducted in October and November 2012, and 29 members responded (a 33 per cent response rate);[3]

(d) Eighty-seven semi-structured interviews conducted in person, in groups or over the telephone with UNHCR staff and stakeholders;

(e) Field missions to the Nairobi and Kakuma, Kenya, offices to understand the monitoring and evaluation function in the field;

(f) A comparison of evaluation functions at similar United Nations organizations, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Food Programme (WFP); and

(g) A meta-evaluation of 28 UNHCR reports from 2010 and 2011, produced by the UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service and identified as evaluation reports on its website.[4]

All analyses were triangulated with data from multiple sources to strengthen the review results.

7. OIOS consulted with UNHCR at key points during the review, and thanks UNHCR for its cooperation and assistance. Annex 1 to the present report includes the response of UNHCR.

III. Background

8. The UNHCR headquarters evaluation function was first established in 1973 with a single evaluation post reporting directly to the High Commissioner. Since then, the function has had a number of configurations: from 1994 to 1999 it was called the Inspection and Evaluation Unit, and from 1999 to 2006 it was known as the Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit. It is currently known as the Policy Development

[2] The 12 offices were selected based on the following criteria: size and type of refugee population, years in operation, mandate and geographic region. Not all nine respondents answered every survey question, and thus the survey data reported are presented from the denominator of the number of respondents who answered the question being reported.

[3] The low response rate limits the ability to generalize conclusions from the survey results. Survey results are calculated without the "no opinion" responses.

[4] OIOS used an independent consultant to conduct the meta-evaluation, which focused on four criteria: quality, credibility, independence and utility, drawn from the United Nations Evaluation Group "Norms for Evaluation in the UN System", "Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports", and "Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function of UN organizations".

and Evaluation Service. The Service discharges a number of responsibilities in addition to evaluation and integrates the functions of policy development, research and knowledge management by providing a focus for external research and publications. The Service is located in the Executive Office and the Head has a bifurcated reporting line, reporting to the High Commissioner on policy matters and to the Deputy High Commissioner on evaluation matters.

9. The Service's terms of reference also require it to collaborate closely with the Deputy High Commissioner and both Assistant High Commissioners on issues such as real-time evaluations, namely, requests from senior managers at headquarters and country offices seeking quick "snapshot" reviews of issues of corporate relevance, along with advice on policy and evaluation issues. The Service's workplan is produced on a rolling basis, updated every six months and reviewed by the Executive Office. This is indicative of the multidimensional responsibilities and dynamic, demand-driven nature of the Service's functions.

10. The Policy Development and Evaluation Service also oversees "New Issues in Refugee Research", a web-based series of research papers focusing on refugee, humanitarian and migration issues, for which it accepts submissions from academic and policy experts, staff members and associates.

11. In addition to evaluation conducted by the Service, some of the larger UNHCR country offices have commissioned their own programme evaluations on an ad hoc basis. However, there is no systematic and regular decentralized evaluation at the regional or country level.

12. Furthermore, the Inspector General's Office also conducts regular inspections of UNHCR operations and offices around the world to ensure that they are being run in conformity with organizational rules and regulations. From 2009 to 2012, the Office conducted 28 standard inspections and three compliance missions. Follow-up to inspection missions are monitored through regular compliance reporting exercises. The Office has issued 27 inspection closure memorandums since July 2011 covering the period from 2008 to 2012.

IV. Evaluation in the United Nations system

13. In assessing the current UNHCR evaluation capacity, it is useful to first provide the context of what a robust and meaningful evaluation function would look like. Programme evaluation in the United Nations system serves two fundamental purposes: (a) to provide for programme accountability to donors, senior leadership and beneficiaries; and (b) to determine programme effectiveness as well as lessons learned for programme improvement.

14. A comprehensive approach to evaluation for an entity such as UNHCR answers three critical questions:

(a) *Are we doing the right things*? This question addresses the relevance, nature and scope of programme interventions and operations. Specifically, the question addresses whether the programme is appropriately designed to adequately address the nature of the issues and problems it is trying to address;

(b) *Are we doing them right*? This question addresses the quality and efficiency of programme interventions and operations. Specifically, the question

addresses what is being implemented well and what is not, and how implementation could be improved;

(c) *Are we doing these things on a sufficient scale to be making a difference*? This question addresses programme coverage, effectiveness and impact, including programme cost-effectiveness and value added. It is the most difficult evaluation question to answer and requires a rigorous mixed-methods approach that triangulates the analysis of multiple data sources in a structured manner. It determines the degree to which a programme is achieving its intended objectives and contributing to larger impacts.

15. An entity must establish a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework as a first step to enable routine and periodic assessment of these fundamental questions. Reliable and credible information must be obtained on the entity's performance to facilitate strategic decision-making and budget and resource allocations.

16. Once interventions and programme operations are well-defined, implemented and under way for some time, there is also a need for periodic and ongoing assessments of quality and sustainability to determine how they can be improved. A comprehensive evaluation portfolio would include evaluations focused at the country, regional and global levels. The evaluations would provide complementary information on how the programme is performing overall and would utilize indicators that track agency outputs, outcomes and impacts.

V. Review results

A. Lack of clear definition of the evaluation function in the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

(a) The current UNHCR evaluation policy does not sufficiently link evaluation to organizational mandates and goals

17. The UNHCR evaluation policy, which was revised in August 2010, defines the overarching framework guiding UNHCR evaluations and is critical for establishing a clear and strong identity for the function. The current UNHCR evaluation policy describes evaluation as "the analysis and assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of the organization's policies, programmes, practices, partnerships and procedures, focusing on their planning, design, implementation and impact". However, it does not articulate a clear and distinct role for evaluation in UNHCR, particularly in relation to other organizational functions such as inspection and performance review. The policy does not describe how evaluation will be conducted within the specific UNHCR context nor does it sufficiently link evaluation to the specific mandates, goals and strategic priorities of the organization, as called for in the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for evaluation policies.[5] For example, the UNDP policy defines the purpose of evaluation as assessing UNDP impact on poverty eradication, economic growth and sustainable development of programme countries; the UNHCR policy has no such link to the specific and unique mandate of UNHCR. Finally, the policy lacks a clear description of the roles

[5] See Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, Standard 1.2.

and responsibilities in respect of evaluation in UNHCR. While the Policy Development and Evaluation Service is referred to as a "focal point for evaluation", the policy contains little detail on its specific tasks and responsibilities, or the roles and contributions expected from regional bureaux and country offices.

(b) Documents labelled as evaluation reports include a variety of different publications

18. The 28 reports identified on the Policy Development and Evaluation Service website as evaluation reports from 2010 and 2011 represented a variety of subjects and genres. Some were clearly evaluations of UNHCR interventions. Others, however, were policy papers, think pieces or academic research papers not directly related to the evaluation of UNHCR interventions. There was no discernible basis for categorizing all these papers as evaluation reports, as categorized on the website.

(c) Evaluation resources are low

19. Resources currently devoted to evaluation in UNHCR are low. For the 2012-2013 biennium, resources identified for the Policy Development and Evaluation Service were estimated at $3.6 million, having risen from $3 million in 2010-2011 and $2.1 million in 2008-2009. This compares unfavourably with evaluation resources in similar United Nations entities. For example, WFP had an evaluation consultancy budget of approximately $5 million for 2012, while the consultancy budget of UNHCR was only $375,000 for the same time period. Overall, the resources dedicated to staffing the evaluation function are very small in relation to the size and breadth of the work of UNHCR. Evaluation resources constitute .05 to .08 per cent of the overall UNHCR budget, which is below the standard benchmark established for evaluation of 3 to 5 per cent of the overall budget of a programme.

(d) The Policy Development and Evaluation Service has served a useful function

20. Given its current mandate and resources, the Policy Development and Evaluation Service has nevertheless served a useful purpose in the organization. With a small cadre of five staff (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 2 P-4 and 1 GS) to support the three integrated functions of evaluation, policy development and research, the Service produced 61 evaluations/reviews, 5 policy reports and 106 publications of "New Issues" web publications between 2006 to 2011.[6] Feedback from UNHCR stakeholders on its work has generally been favourable. A majority of respondents to the Executive Committee survey (80 per cent) were very or somewhat satisfied with the information received from the Service. Also, senior headquarters managers who were interviewed noted that the Service provides useful information on key policy issues. A majority of the country office survey respondents (six out of seven who responded to the question) reported that they have used Service reports, specifically mentioning that the analyses of the issues they were facing in their own programme operations and the reporting of good practices from within the organization were particularly useful.

21. In particular, the Service has a high-profile identity in respect of policy issues within UNHCR. It is often called upon to provide input for speeches by the High Commissioner and, in recent years, has also taken on the role of an internal think tank responding to the High Commissioner's requests for targeted information. The

[6] *Source*: OIOS compilation of reports on the UNHCR website.

Service also oversees "New Issues in Refugee Research", a web-based series of research papers focusing on refugee, humanitarian and migration issues, for which it accepts submissions from academic and policy experts, and contributes to the flagship publication *The State of the World's Refugees*. Furthermore, the Service has been recognized as a pioneer in terms of supporting the development of real-time evaluation, which has become common in humanitarian practice within and outside the United Nations system. In terms of strategic, corporate-level policy advice, the Service is credited with helping to promote UNHCR thinking on such issues as urban refugees and the age, gender and diversity approach to programme formulation and implementation.

B. Current evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: key United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for independence, credibility and utility not fully met

22. Despite not being clearly defined, OIOS assessed the evaluation capacity that does currently exist in UNHCR. This capacity has been constrained by limitations in three critical criteria derived from United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards: independence, credibility and utility. Each of these three criteria will be discussed in detail below.

(a) Independence: the evaluation function of UNHCR has limited independence

23. The independence criterion is derived from United Nations Evaluation Group Norm 6, which establishes that the evaluation process should be impartial and independent in its function from the process concerned with policymaking, programme delivery and management at an organization.[7] It also requires systemic measures for ensuring the necessary objectivity and impartiality of evaluation.

24. This criterion is significant, since it ensures that the evaluation function, both in theory and in practice, operates in an independent manner, and allows those undertaking evaluations to have no bias or appearance of bias. The function should be placed organizationally so that it is independent from other management and programme functions under its purview. Typically, it is placed in the executive office of senior management or located independently as a separate unit.

25. Additionally, the head of an independent evaluation function should report directly to the governing body or the head of the organization (see United Nations Evaluation Group Standard 1.1). In practice, this means reporting to senior management staff who are not involved in programmes that are the subject of evaluation. Usually, this is the most senior manager at the organization. In the same manner, the evaluation function should also have full discretion in directly submitting its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making pertaining to the subject of evaluation. In addition, a system must be in place for systematic consideration of the findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in evaluations, which also allows the information to be utilized for organizational decision-making (see United Nations Evaluation Group Norm 2.6).

[7] See the United Nations Evaluation Group's Norms for Evaluation in the UN System.

26. Within UNHCR, evaluation is integrated with and embedded within a larger section (Policy Development and Evaluation Service) that undertakes evaluation, policy development and research; the UNHCR evaluation policy states that the Service also assists the Executive Office to identify the need for new or revised policy statements and, in close consultation with other divisions, departments and regional bureaux, contributes to their formulation, dissemination and promotion.[8] Service staff members undertake all three activities, with none dedicated exclusively to evaluation. The policy responsibilities of the Service are broad, covering the formulation of global operational policies (other than those for finance, administration, procurement or human resources management), forward-looking policy analysis and development capacity, and identification of the need for new or revised policy statements in consultation with divisions.[8] While UNHCR has intentionally sought to link policy and evaluation through the co-location of these functions within the Service to ensure that evaluation findings are fed directly into the policymaking process, there is risk of real or perceived conflict of interest since the Service plays a dual role in both developing policy and in evaluating the implementation of that policy. In UNHCR, further risk of conflict of interest exists with regard to joint evaluations undertaken with other entities; in such evaluations, the Service participates as both evaluation partner and the entity within UNHCR responsible for coordinating a management response on behalf of the organization.

27. Furthermore, while the location of the Policy Development and Evaluation Service within the High Commissioner's office is appropriate in terms of promoting structural independence, the Head of the Service reports to the High Commissioner on policy matters and to the Deputy High Commissioner on evaluation matters.[9] This reporting line places evaluation within direct resource management reporting lines (although the Deputy High Commissioner does have responsibility for oversight), thus potentially compromising independence. It is also not aligned with good practice at other United Nation entities. For example, at WFP and UNDP, the Evaluation Director reports to the Executive Director and to the Executive Board and does not have a dual reporting line to other senior managers.

28. The current work-planning process for evaluation in UNHCR also poses a risk to the independence of the function, since it is largely demand-driven, although the Policy Development and Evaluation Service has full methodological independence in designing its evaluations. There is no strategic risk-based work-planning system in place that lays the foundation, in consultation with critical stakeholders, for an independent assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of UNHCR and the topics presenting the greatest risk to the organization and therefore meriting evaluation.

29. While the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme is not the governing body of UNHCR, it undertakes an important advisory role and approves the organization's budget. The Policy Development and Evaluation Service has adopted the good practice of providing an annual report to the Executive Committee on the activities for the year (see, for example, A/AC.96/1115). However, evaluation reports themselves are not directly tabled for discussion or review; the Executive Committee is only advisory and must still go through the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth

[8] See UNHCR Evaluation Policy, August 2010, page 9.

[9] See UNHCR organigram and evaluation policy.

Committee of the General Assembly. UNHCR must strike the same right balance between reporting to its Executive Committee and these other bodies.

30. Feedback from the Executive Committee members further suggests the need to strengthen the independence of the evaluation function. A majority of Executive Committee survey respondents (64 per cent) reported that the Committee should be responsible for ensuring that evaluations are conducted in an independent and impartial manner, and the same percentage agreed that the Committee should be responsible for ensuring that evaluation contributes to decision-making and management. Executive Committee survey respondents also indicated that there should be more time for discussion on evaluation and requested that the Policy Development and Evaluation Service keep them better informed on the UNHCR evaluation process overall. Finally, Executive Committee survey respondents suggested that the Policy Development and Evaluation Service annual report should include more information from evaluations, such as findings on effectiveness, efficiency and impact, and how evaluations are being integrated into and improving the UNHCR work programme.

(b) Credibility: The credibility of the evaluation function in UNHCR is constrained by methodological limitations in assessing results

31. The credibility criterion is derived from United Nations Evaluation Group Norms 5, 8, 9 and 11, which address the impartiality, quality, competency and ethics of evaluation. Credibility is dependent on the expertise and independence of the evaluators and the degree of transparency of the evaluation process. Credible evaluations are impartial and methodologically rigorous and present both programme achievements and programme challenges. Views of all stakeholders are taken into account and in the event that interested parties have different views, these should be reflected in the evaluation analysis and reporting (see United Nations Evaluation Group Norm 5). Credible evaluations are also designed and planned with appropriate methods.

32. While the staff of the Policy Development and Evaluation Service bring a wide range of relevant operational experience, their evaluation competencies are more limited. Within the United Nations, evaluation functions address credibility by ensuring that staff have evaluation experience and skills to both conduct evaluations and manage externally hired evaluators (consultants). Agencies with rotational policies often ensure a core qualified staff, with some, such as WFP, having a 50/50 mix of evaluation and programme staff. This ensures that evaluations are credible from both an evaluation and programme perspective. Common guidelines and consistent evaluative approaches also strengthen credibility.

33. Although the job description for the Head of the Policy Development and Evaluation Service requires experience in evaluation, such experience is not required for the other professional staff. The latter are internal staff members on four- to five-year rotational posts who typically do not have evaluation training, experience or competencies relating to evaluation. Owing to UNHCR human resources rules requiring staff rotation, the Service does not have a secure cadre of staff at headquarters for the function. The current head of the Service has therefore had to train the professional staff on basic evaluation methods and approaches.

34. Survey and interview data provide further evidence of the problem posed by the lack of qualified evaluation staff in UNHCR. Four out of seven country offices

responding to the country office survey volunteered that more evaluation training and expertise is needed at the country level to strengthen the evaluation function. Also, key headquarters staff who were interviewed confirmed that there was room to strengthen evaluation methodology in order to more effectively assess the impact of UNHCR work on the ground.

35. To supplement staff resources, the Policy Development and Evaluation Service has also used consultants who are experienced evaluators to assist with its workplan, although resources for this have been low. The Service's consultancy budget has remained constant in recent years, at approximately $350,000 to $375,000, and has not grown relative to the overall budget of UNHCR. Thus, the use of expert consultants with evaluation skills does not fully address the gap created by evaluation staff with limited evaluation backgrounds.

36. OIOS undertook a meta-evaluation of the 28 reports issued by the Policy Development and Evaluation Service in 2010 and 2011 to determine whether the reports met basic United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards and to assess overall strengths and weaknesses.[10] The overall strengths of the Service reports included the presentation and overall rationale for undertaking the evaluation/research, identification of the subject of the report, inclusion of alternate perspectives, and manageable nature of the recommendations. The reports were generally well-written and logically structured. For example, the Service has published two series of evaluations on protracted refugee situations and on the phenomenon of mixed migration. These reports were mostly standardized, so that the reader became familiar with the structure and knew what to expect across the set of papers. Reports also clearly identified why the evaluation/research was being conducted and why it was important to UNHCR strategic interests, often citing a need identified by the High Commissioner.

37. However, the reports reviewed scored lower on quality, with a high degree of variance among all the reports assessed, primarily owing to methodological limitations in assessing programme results and impact, which admittedly are challenging to assess given the UNHCR mandate. The reports often did not have clear findings in respect of the results of UNHCR interventions but instead highlighted general challenges, constraints or issues. Even in reports that were clearly evaluations, it was often not obvious what the results of the organization's work were. The reports lacked information on the evaluation criteria, data-collection methods and analytical framework. This was particularly the case with evaluations conducted with Policy Development and Evaluation Service staff and mixed teams. The evaluation reports undertaken by external consultants managed by Service staff, who also finalized the evaluations, were found to be of higher quality than those produced by Service staff and mixed teams.

38. Similar to the findings of the meta-evaluation, UNHCR stakeholders have reported insufficient evaluation of UNHCR performance and results in respect of all aspects of its mandate, including both its protection and programme work. A majority of Executive Committee survey respondents (55 per cent) reported that the Policy Development and Evaluation Service has been somewhat or very ineffective in providing evidence-based information for decision-making, and some suggest the

[10] Meta-evaluation is the "systematic review of evaluations to determine the quality of their processes and findings" (Cooksy and Caracelli, "Quality, Context and Use: Issues in Achieving the Goals of Meta-evaluation" (2005)).

need for evaluation results to feed into UNHCR work programmes. Some of these respondents also volunteered that UNHCR evaluations should elaborate more clearly on the basis for their findings and conclusions. Furthermore, senior managers at headquarters identified a gap in robust evaluation for determining the results and impact of UNHCR on the ground, and a lack of evaluative evidence on how cost-efficient and effective UNHCR has been. Two out of seven country office survey respondents stated that UNHCR evaluation reports provided senior managers with assessments of results achieved only to a small extent or not at all, and four said only to some extent. Also, a majority (four out of seven) stated that evaluation reports provided stakeholders with an opportunity to present their assessments of UNHCR mandated activities only to a small extent.

(c) Utility: limited use of evaluation and recommendation follow-up poses significant risks for learning and accountability

39. The utility criterion is derived from United Nations Evaluation Group Norms 1, 2, 8, 10 and 12, which address the definition, responsibility, quality, transparency, consultation and follow-up of evaluations. Utility is dependent on clear and concise evaluation findings that are perceived as relevant and useful and have an impact on decision-making, including through systematic follow-up. To ensure maximum utility of evaluation reports, clear procedures for recommendation follow-up and implementation, with established timelines for checking on the status of implementation and progress, should be established. Within the United Nations, it is common practice for evaluation functions, including those in UNDP and WFP, to have established clear procedures for response to evaluation reports by management and a forum for discussion of the reports, such as in the governing body.

40. Currently, there is no regular and systematic follow-up process in UNHCR for discussing evaluation results and tracking evaluation recommendations.[11] This undermines the utility of evaluation reports both at headquarters and in the field and poses significant risk for learning and accountability. Evaluation reports lack systematic follow-up by UNHCR management, staff or the Executive Committee, and there is no formal management response to the reports. There is also no formal mechanism for considering evaluation findings and conclusions. Additionally, while the reports are on the UNHCR website, there are no formal mechanisms for extracting lessons learned from the evaluations and integrating them back into organizational work processes and programmes. Almost half of Executive Committee survey respondents (46 per cent) stated that the Committee should ensure systematic consideration of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

41. UNHCR also lacks a systematic method for tracking the implementation of recommendations. There is no formal mechanism that assesses whether recommendations are being enacted, nor is any individual or entity held accountable for enacting them. Headquarters and field staff who were interviewed widely acknowledged this deficiency as needing improvement. Furthermore, a majority of Executive Committee survey respondents with an opinion on the issue (56 per cent) reported that UNHCR was somewhat or very ineffective in providing follow-up on how findings, conclusions and recommendations have been integrated into

[11] UNHCR reports that since the OIOS review, it has introduced a management response requirement. However, such a requirement was not in place at the time of the review.

UNHCR's work. A majority (56 per cent) also stated that they were somewhat or very dissatisfied with follow-up by the Policy Development and Evaluation Service on recommendations. In fact, evaluation follow-up procedures were the one component of the current evaluation function that received — across the board — the lowest rating from Executive Committee members. Without adequate evaluation follow-up, it will remain difficult to assess the organization's impact and value-for-money.

42. The UNHCR Internal Compliance and Accountability Committee established in June 2012 has the potential to address this weakness in follow-up. The Committee was established to strengthen organizational and personal accountability and is intended to be the central internal body for prioritizing and monitoring the implementation of recommendations received from audits, evaluations, inspections and ad hoc reports. The headquarters and field staff interviewed also identified the Internal Compliance and Accountability Committee as a potential body for fostering knowledge management by applying evaluation lessons learned into policy and programming. Given how recently the Committee was established, it remains to be seen whether it will be able to adequately address some of the gaps in evaluation follow-up identified in the present review.

C. Lack of a functional centralized and decentralized evaluation system common to other United Nations entities with a strong field presence

43. Given that most UNHCR operations are in the field away from its headquarters, an evaluation function that comprises both centralized and decentralized evaluation would facilitate an assessment of its work at all levels: field, region and headquarters. Centralized evaluation has a broader scope, assessing work at the global, organization-wide level. It is carried out independently from those responsible for protection and programme operations, and the entity undertaking the evaluation is not responsible for producing the results it seeks to evaluate. Centralized evaluation addresses organization-wide, cross-cutting strategic issues of relevance to the entire organization. It also independently assesses the quality of decentralized evaluations and establishes the criteria against which decentralized evaluation activities will be assessed in the organization. Generally, this function is undertaken at a headquarters location.

44. Decentralized evaluation, on the other hand, has a comparatively narrower scope. It is carried out at the field level, including in both country and regional offices, and includes a headquarters component to support and coordinate decentralized activities and to consolidate and report on results where appropriate. It is embedded within programme operations, the results of which it seeks to evaluate, and addresses issues of specific relevance and priority in country and regional programming. Decentralization ensures that the evidence generated is relevant to the local context, which helps to inform national policies. Generally, this function is undertaken at the operational level by regional and/or field offices with a close tie to the headquarters division appropriate to the evaluation subject at headquarters.

45. In order for the decentralized evaluation function to be credible, and to follow good practice from other operational entities within the United Nations, several criteria must be met. First, there is a need for quality assurance, which is typically

the responsibility of the centralized evaluation function, as is the case in UNDP and the United Nations Population Fund, which produces an annual report on its quality assessments of country evaluations. Also, common organizational standards and procedures, as well as training for field staff on the basic conduct of evaluation, are required to facilitate consistency and reliability among different country and regional offices. A work-planning process is also needed to ensure a regular and coordinated programme of decentralized evaluation; this typically would be undertaken by the headquarters office with responsibility for field operations.

46. Two challenges faced by other United Nations entities with centralized and decentralized evaluation functions are: (a) the need to clearly delineate the scope, including respective roles and responsibilities, of centralized and decentralized evaluation activities; and (b) the need to establish an integrated and comprehensive evaluation function that avoids a disjointed approach to evaluation in the organization. These have been addressed through the establishment of clear and precise evaluation policies, coordination mechanisms, and regular and open communication.

47. The lack of a regular and systematic decentralized evaluation function in UNHCR has resulted in limited evaluative evidence on UNHCR country programme performance, including its protection, solutions and assistance activities. As illustrated by the field mission to UNHCR offices in Kenya, there are currently no regular and systematic assessments of the results achieved by individual country offices that could provide useful information for decision-making regarding future country programming, specifically on overall focus, strategic priorities, critical activities and impact on beneficiaries.

48. The UNHCR decentralized evaluations that do take place are generally ad hoc and undertaken at the discretion of country office managers; they also vary with regard to scope, timing and type. Four out of nine country office survey respondents reported having carried out an evaluation in the past two years. Most notably, real-time evaluations are conducted by the Policy Development and Evaluation Service on a needs-driven basis, under the guidance of the Assistant High Commissioner for Operations, to respond to emergencies. Attention is currently being paid to the need to regularize the protocols for these exercises. In some cases, these evaluations are taken on as inter-agency exercises to provide a managerial snapshot to gauge progress and highlight constraints requiring instant operational attention.

49. The programme performance reporting that currently takes place at the country level has the potential to feed into and support more systematic decentralized evaluation. Much of this activity is part of the annual programming cycle and its monitoring and reporting requirements. Programme performance reporting provides useful information on programming activity and progress towards results. For example, the Kakuma, Kenya, field office undertakes an annual operations review that is a participatory process for reviewing UNHCR results with its implementing partners and beneficiaries.

50. Furthermore, existing capacity within the Division of Programme Support and Management and the Division of International Protection could be better utilized to strengthen decentralized evaluation. There is opportunity to strategically build upon existing activities and resources to develop a more systematic structure for decentralized evaluation by strengthening the existing components for evaluation within these two Divisions.

51. There are models within the United Nations that UNHCR could consider in developing a centralized and decentralized evaluation system. For example, WFP has both a centralized and decentralized evaluation function;[12] the former is based in headquarters and undertakes strategic evaluations with a global perspective, while the latter, following the same standards as centralized evaluations, is the responsibility of regional bureaux and country offices and focuses on country operations.[13] WFP undertakes a portfolio of evaluation from both its decentralized and centralized functions, including:

- Strategic evaluations, which take a global perspective and focus on strategic issues for WFP as a whole (centralized evaluation)
- Policy evaluations, which examine to what extent WFP policies have achieved their objectives (centralized and decentralized evaluation)
- Country portfolio evaluations, which help country offices to understand their portfolio and what difference it makes (decentralized evaluation)
- Impact evaluations, which provide an in-depth analysis of the impact that WFP work has on beneficiaries (centralized evaluation)
- Operations evaluations, which address operational relevance, efficiency and effectiveness (centralized and decentralized evaluation)
- Joint evaluations, which are conducted jointly with evaluation offices of other organizations on any of the above types of evaluations[14]

52. Another relevant model for centralized and decentralized evaluation is UNDP. Paragraph 17 of the UNDP evaluation policy identifies two categories of evaluation in the organization: independent (centralized) evaluations conducted by the Evaluation Office and decentralized evaluations commissioned by programme units and conducted by independent external experts. The policy further defines the centralized Evaluation Office as being the custodian of the UNDP evaluation function responsible for planning independent evaluations, conducting thematic and country programme evaluations (known as assessments of development results) and ensuring that its evaluations provide strategic coverage of UNDP results and feed into decision-making. All independent evaluation reports are presented to the Executive Board alongside the new country programme document. The centralized function also sets standards for the planning, conduct and use of decentralized evaluations and assesses the quality of those evaluations. Decentralized evaluations, on the other hand, are commissioned by regional bureaux and country offices and are focused on programme outcomes at the field level. The Evaluation Office has established the Evaluation Resource Centre database containing evaluation plans for country programmes. All reports produced in accordance with these evaluation plans are assessed by the Evaluation Office, which reports on compliance with the evaluation plans as well as the quality of decentralized evaluation as part of its annual report to the UNDP Executive Board. All UNDP evaluation reports, as well as management responses, are available to the public on the Evaluation Resource Centre/UNDP website.

[12] See WFP Evaluation Policy 2008, para. 18.

[13] See Ibid., paras. 13 and 21.

[14] See http://www.wfp.org/about/evaluation and WFP Evaluation Policy 2008, WFP/EB.2/2008/4-A.

VI. Conclusion

53. Given the critical issues UNHCR faces in its work, and its direct impact on individual lives, it is imperative that evidence-based evaluation on programme results and outcomes, although challenging, be available to guide decision-making on programme design and implementation. UNHCR needs to know if what it is doing works and is cost-efficient, and what changes could be made to how it does business in order to have an even greater impact. In order to achieve this, it needs a strong, robust and fully comprehensive evaluation function. While the Policy Development and Evaluation Service has served a pivotal and useful role in the organization, given its current mandate and resources, it has not been able to fully meet the organization's evolving evaluation needs.

54. The key question that UNHCR needs to answer is what role it wants evaluation to play in the organization. Once this is decided, senior management needs to advocate for the function and ensure a sufficiently robust enabling environment for evaluation to be undertaken. A crucial part of this will be to build and support an evaluation culture in UNHCR, one in which evaluation is seen as adding value to the work of the organization and demonstrating UNHCR results, impact on the lives of beneficiaries and value-for-money.

55. There are significant steps that UNHCR can undertake to strengthen its evaluation function. First, a more explicit and detailed discussion that links evaluation with the UNHCR overall mandate, expected accomplishments and goals would facilitate the strengthening of evaluation activities by defining their intended contribution to achieving results. This should be addressed specifically in the evaluation policy. Evaluation in UNHCR should answer three key questions: are the right things being done; are they being done right; and are they being done on a scale that makes a difference.

56. UNHCR would also benefit from a robust evaluation function that encompasses both centralized and decentralized evaluation. Centralized evaluation would address organization-wide strategic issues and should be carried out independently from those responsible for programme operations and the results it seeks to evaluate. Decentralized evaluation would have a narrower scope and should be embedded within programme operations. UNHCR can more strategically utilize existing resources and activities within the Division of Programme Support and Management and the Division of International Protection in order to strengthen and regularize its decentralized evaluation.

57. Investments in results-based systems have the potential to reinvigorate the evaluation function as part of an integrated monitoring and evaluation system. The corporate attention and multimillion dollar resource envelope that UNHCR has devoted since 2006 to establishing an extensive results-based system that adopts a logical approach for planning, management, data collection and evidence-based assessment of its annual programme cycle is an important component that should be integrated into the larger UNHCR evaluation system.

58. The strengthening of the evaluation function in UNHCR to better contribute to organizational results, learning and accountability will take time and needs a long-term vision and strategy as well as strong leadership. OIOS has made five important recommendations to start this process.

VII. Recommendations

Recommendation 1 (result A)

59. UNHCR should establish a dedicated and discrete evaluation unit at headquarters with responsibility for conducting programmatic and cross-cutting strategic evaluations of UNHCR. In establishing this unit, three criteria should be met:

(a) The unit should be independent from any other programme operations;

(b) The unit should work solely on evaluation and not be tasked with any additional responsibilities such as policy development; and

(c) The unit should be given sufficient organizational independence with regard to evaluation planning, conduct and reporting.

60. There are several options available to UNHCR in implementing this recommendation. They include keeping evaluation within the Policy Development and Evaluation Service but making it a separate unit staffed by evaluators who are responsible solely for evaluation; moving the evaluation function into the Inspector General's Office; and creating a totally separate evaluation unit that reports directly to the High Commissioner.

61. UNHCR partially agreed with this recommendation.

Recommendation 2 (results A and C)

62. UNHCR should revise its evaluation policy in order to establish an adequate framework for how evaluation is implemented in the organization, including the gaps identified in the present review. Specifically, it should:

(a) Provide a sufficiently clear explanation of the concept and role of evaluation within the specific UNHCR organizational context;

(b) Establish a system consisting of centralized evaluation undertaken at the headquarters level and decentralized evaluation undertaken at the field (regional and country) level, with a clear strategy that relies on complementarity and synergy between the two functions;

(c) More clearly define and delineate the respective roles, responsibilities and objectives of centralized and decentralized evaluation;

(d) Clarify the reporting lines for evaluation, including consideration of direct reporting of key, strategic evaluation reports to the Executive Committee; and

(e) Delineate a regular and systematic evaluation workplanning process, based on the organization's programme logic, that incorporates all types of work undertaken by UNHCR as well as ad hoc requests, mandates or joint evaluations with other United Nations agencies or offices.

63. UNHCR agreed with this recommendation.

Recommendation 3 (result B)

64. UNHCR should strengthen the rigour and utility of its evaluations by establishing procedures and methodologies for assessing UNHCR results. Specifically, this should include:

(a) Development of evaluation terms of reference with clearly stated evaluation criteria, questions and data-collection methods, and evaluation design;

(b) Development of evaluation methodologies that will enable the assessment of the effectiveness and impact of UNHCR interventions in the field; and

(c) Reports that clearly and directly speak to the results achieved by UNHCR.

65. UNHCR agreed with this recommendation.

Recommendation 4 (result B)

66. UNHCR should develop a regular and systematic process for follow-up to evaluation recommendations. Specifically, this should include:

(a) Clear mechanisms for developing a management response to all evaluations;

(b) The stipulation that an action plan stating how and when the recommendations will be implemented be required for all evaluations;

(c) Procedures for periodic and regular follow-up on recommendation implementation; and

(d) Establishment of clear accountability for recommendation implementation.

67. UNHCR agreed with this recommendation.

Recommendation 5 (result C)

68. UNHCR should develop a strategy for strengthening decentralized evaluation in the field. Specifically, the strategy should consider:

(a) Processes and mechanisms needed for regular and systematic evaluation at the regional and country levels;

(b) How to better exploit existing capacity within the Division of Programme Support and Management and the Division of International Protection;

(c) Size and type of country programme activities when developing a country-level evaluation function;

(d) How to build an evaluation culture among programme managers in the field;

(e) Respective roles and responsibilities of centralized and decentralized evaluation; and

(f) Where and how centralized and decentralized evaluation should be integrated into the UNHCR programming cycle.

69. UNHCR agreed with this recommendation.

(*Signed*) Carman L. **Lapointe**
Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services
22 March 2013

Annex*

Memorandum dated 20 March 2013 from the Deputy High Commissioner of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees addressed to the Inspection and Evaluation Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

UNHCR response to OIOS review of UNHCR evaluation capacity

1. UNHCR welcomes the review by OIOS of UNHCR's evaluation capacity. It nevertheless takes exception to the following aspects of the report:

> Current UNHCR evaluation capacity does not fully meet United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for independence, credibility and utility; in particular, the credibility of UNHCR's evaluation function is constrained by methodological limitations in assessing results.

Response:

The evaluation function is structured differently across the United Nations system, whereas the OIOS report appears to suggest that there is only one standard model. In UNHCR, the Policy Development and Evaluation Service is a unified structure which enjoys full methodological independence. Moreover, UNHCR's evaluation policy prevents senior management from interfering with evaluation findings and recommendations. UNHCR believes that a demand-driven approach to evaluation does not compromise independence. On the contrary, a demand-driven approach is more likely to ensure that evaluation focuses on operations and issues that are of strategic importance to the organization and which are characterized by a high level of risk. A thorough review of evaluations undertaken by the Policy Development and Evaluation Service would demonstrate that senior management does not request the Service to undertake evaluations of operations that are deemed to be successful. Indeed, evaluations are frequently prompted by perceived organizational difficulties and weaknesses.

The organization refutes the suggestion that its evaluations currently lack rigour and do not focus on the effectiveness and impact of UNHCR interventions. Moreover, the OIOS comments about UNHCR's evaluation function lacking credibility are not supported by the positive feedback and interactions that the Policy Development and Evaluation Service and the Executive Office enjoy with Executive Committee members, other United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations and other members of the humanitarian community. Major donors in particular have been consistently supportive of the Service and its work.

2. UNHCR appreciates the recommendations of the review and would like to focus on them with the following observations:

* In the present annex, OIOS presents the full text of comments from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This practice has been instituted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/263, following the recommendation of the independent Audit Advisory Committee.

Recommendation 1 (result A)

UNHCR should establish a dedicated and discrete evaluation unit in headquarters with responsibility for conducting programmatic and cross-cutting strategic evaluations of UNHCR. In establishing this unit, three criteria should be met:

(a) The unit should be independent from any other programme operations;

(b) The unit should work solely on evaluation and not be tasked with any additional responsibilities such as policy development; and

(c) The unit should be given sufficient organizational independence with regard to evaluation planning, conduct and reporting.

There are several options available to UNHCR in implementing this recommendation. They include keeping evaluation within the Policy Development and Evaluation Service, but making it a separate unit staffed by evaluators that are responsible solely for evaluation; moving the evaluation function into the Office of the Inspector General; and creating a totally separate evaluation unit that reports directly to the High Commissioner.

Recommendation 1: UNHCR partially agrees to the recommendations with the following observations:

UNHCR regards evaluation and policy analysis as integral functions. Furthermore, UNHCR values organizational independence with regard to evaluation planning, conduct and reporting and agrees that it needs capacity and resources to conduct evaluations commensurate with its annual budget. This, however, requires further internal analysis and reflection, also in the context of the future of oversight in UNHCR and the options provided in this OIOS report, to chart the way forward.

Recommendation 2 (results A and C)

UNHCR should revise its evaluation policy in order to establish an adequate framework for how evaluation is implemented in the organization, including the gaps identified in the review. Specifically, it should:

(a) Provide a sufficiently clear explanation of the concept and role of evaluation within the specific UNHCR organizational context;

(b) Establish a system consisting of centralized evaluation undertaken at the headquarters level and decentralized evaluation undertaken at the field (regional and country) level, with a clear strategy that relies on complementarity and synergy between the two functions;

(c) More clearly define and delineate the respective roles, responsibilities and objectives of centralized and decentralized evaluation;

(d) Clarify the reporting lines for evaluation, including consideration of direct reporting of key, strategic evaluation reports to the Executive Committee; and

(e) Delineate a regular and systematic evaluation workplanning process, based on the organization's programme logic, that incorporates all types of work undertaken by UNHCR as well as ad hoc requests, mandates or joint evaluations with other United Nations agencies or offices.

Recommendation 2: UNHCR agrees to the recommendations and will continue to periodically report to the Executive Committee on key evaluations of strategic nature.

Recommendation 3 (result B)

UNHCR should strengthen the rigour and utility of its evaluations by establishing procedures and methodologies for assessing UNHCR results. Specifically, this should include:

(a) Development of evaluation terms of reference with clearly stated evaluation criteria, questions and data-collection methods, and evaluation design;

(b) Development of evaluation methodologies that will enable the assessment of the effectiveness and impact of UNHCR interventions in the field; and

(c) Reports that clearly and directly speak to the results achieved by UNHCR.

Recommendation 3: UNHCR agrees to the recommendations.

Recommendation 4 (result B)

UNHCR should develop a regular and systematic process for follow-up to evaluation recommendations. Specifically, this should include:

(a) Clear mechanisms for developing a management response to all evaluations;

(b) The stipulation that an action plan stating how and when the recommendations will be implemented be required for all evaluations;

(c) Procedures for periodic and regular follow-up on recommendation implementation; and

(d) Establishment of clear accountability for recommendation implementation.

Recommendation 4: UNHCR agrees to the recommendations and, in this context, has recently introduced a new management response requirement for evaluations, overseen by the newly established Internal Compliance and Accountability Committee.

Recommendation 5 (result C)

UNHCR should develop a strategy for strengthening decentralized evaluation in the field. Specifically, the strategy should consider:

(a) Processes and mechanisms needed for regular and systematic evaluation at the regional and country levels;

(b) How to better exploit existing capacity within the Division of Programme Support and Management and the Division of International Protection;

(c) Size and type of country programme activities when developing a country-level evaluation function;

(d) How to build an evaluation culture among programme managers in the field;

(e) Respective roles and responsibilities of centralized and decentralized evaluation; and

(f) Where and how centralized and decentralized evaluation should be integrated into the UNHCR programming cycle.

Recommendation 5: UNHCR agrees to the recommendations with the following observations:

A decentralized evaluation function in UNHCR would have to be considered as a long-term process since it has important resource and capacity implications. This will include enhanced expertise and capacity to provide quality control to and regularly monitor a decentralized evaluation function.

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/6

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
1 April 2013

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
Organizational session, 25 April 2013
Substantive session, 3-28 June 2013
Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Coordination questions: New Partnership for Africa's Development

United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report provides an overview of activities undertaken by the United Nations system in support of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) since June 2012. It is organized around the nine clusters established under the Regional Coordination Mechanism of the United Nations agencies working in Africa, convened by the Economic Commission for Africa.

In the report, it is reiterated that there is a need for the United Nations entities to develop a monitoring approach to review and evaluate the impact of their support in the implementation of NEPAD. A call is made for the United Nations to provide more focused and coordinated support to African countries to implement the recommendations made in the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, entitled "The future we want", and to ensure coherence between the recommendations and the post-2015 development agenda.

* E/AC.51/2013/1.

13-27564 (E) 150413

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. At its forty-fifth session, the Committee for Programme and Coordination recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to report to the Committee, at its forty-sixth session, and annually thereafter, on the support provided by the United Nations system to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), a programme of the African Union (see A/60/16, para. 237). The request was endorsed by the Assembly in its resolution 67/236.

II. Support for the implementation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development

2. The present report describes activities undertaken by United Nations system entities in support of NEPAD since June 2012, organized around nine thematic clusters corresponding to the priorities of NEPAD. It was prepared on the basis of input received from United Nations system organizations, agencies and departments that responded to the request of the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa for contributions regarding key activities, programmes and projects implemented in 2011-2012, highlighting results and impact in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

A. Infrastructure development

3. The infrastructure cluster coordinated by the Economic Commission for Africa comprises four subclusters: water and sanitation, energy, information and communications technology and transport.

4. During the reporting period, the World Bank strengthened its involvement in Africa's regional integration through its Regional Integration Assistance Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa and committed in excess of $2 billion in development financing for operations as part of infrastructure projects identified in the African Union/NEPAD African Action Plan 2010-2015. In the area of energy, the World Bank supported the Eastern Electricity Highway Project, which facilitated access to electricity to 2.2 million people in Ethiopia and 500,000 people in Kenya. The Economic Commission for Africa provided substantive input into the formulation of the energy and transport sections of the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa in line with the institutional architecture for infrastructure development in Africa.

5. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NEPAD Agency), the African Union Commission and the African Development Bank successfully collaborated in support of the Secretary-General's "Sustainable Energy for All" initiative. Through this partnership, UNDP supported gap analyses in 16 sub-Saharan African countries and organized a series of regional workshops resulting in the development of the Africa guidelines for national action plans to attain sustainable energy for all.

6. The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) partnered with Barefoot College, India, to train rural women

in Liberia, South Sudan, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania to become solar engineers. Through the initiative, communities benefited from solar electrification. Cluster members also developed a gender-sensitive bioenergy framework and policy guidelines to promote local decent employment in the bioenergy field and public-private partnership models to finance rural energy infrastructure development in Africa.

7. In the information and communications technology sector, the Economic Commission for Africa, in collaboration with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), organized a series of workshops on harmonization of cyberlegislation and cybersecurity, the outcomes of which include a draft African Union convention on cybersecurity to be adopted in May 2013 at the twenty-first ordinary session of the summit of the African Union. Member States were urged to integrate cybersecurity policies and legislation into broad information and communications technology policies and strategies, while the regional economic communities were urged to consider cybersecurity and support the harmonization of cybersecurity policies and legislation. ITU continued to work with the NEPAD Agency, the African Union Commission, the Economic Commission for Africa, the African Development Bank, the World Bank and other partners in follow-up to the Connect Africa Summit in developing information and communications technology infrastructure in Africa. Its work had a direct impact on the promotion and advocacy of NEPAD public-private partnerships.

8. Through its projects to create a Central African Internet backbone and West African regional communications infrastructure, the World Bank supported the connection of seven African countries to international broadband cables and regional networks. Consequently, Internet access has increased by at least 50 per cent in almost all the countries involved.

9. On water and sanitation, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) strengthened national and regional capacity in the use of nuclear techniques for water resources. In July 2012, it launched a four-year project on water resource management for the Sahel to enhance the capacity of Sahelian countries to assess and manage their water resources. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) conducted capacity-building seminars for more than 700 African government officials in core areas, including maritime safety, port security and the protection of the marine environment from ship-based pollution.

B. Governance

10. The governance cluster, coordinated by UNDP, supports the governance programmes of the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Agency and the regional economic communities. The cluster comprises four subclusters: economic and corporate governance, human rights, public service and administration and democracy and governance.

11. Within the framework of its regional programme on drug control, crime prevention and criminal justice reform in the Arab States for the period 2011-2015, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) supported newly established Governments in Egypt and Libya to institute governance reforms and

establish the rule of law. UNODC assisted national authorities in Egypt to establish mechanisms to combat money-laundering and facilitate asset recovery.

12. UNIDO supported the NEPAD economic governance agenda by assisting enterprises to adapt their business environments to international norms. It worked to restructure and upgrade industries in the Central African Economic and Monetary Community region by supporting private-sector development at the policy, institutional and industrial levels to achieve competitiveness in price, quality and innovation.

13. Through its e-Regulations system, UNCTAD helped 11 African countries to simplify their rules and procedures for setting up a business. This contributed to increased transparency and greater institutional capacity, thereby increasing the attractiveness of African countries as foreign investment destinations. The UNCTAD Investment Policy Review programme helped to improve the business environment in several African countries. In addition, four African countries that were reviewed currently feature in the top 10 reformers of the World Bank's ease of doing business rankings. In 2012, UNCTAD published its Entrepreneurship Policy Framework, which provides African policymakers with a toolkit to formulate, monitor and evaluate national entrepreneurship policies. On the basis of the recommendations made in the Framework, the Government of Nigeria revised its national policy on micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises.

14. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) provided technical advice to assist national planning processes in Chad, the Comoros, the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Kenya, Madagascar and Sierra Leone for the adoption of intellectual property strategies and in conducting national intellectual property audits. By providing technical support to the African Group in Geneva during multilateral negotiations, WIPO enhanced Africa's participation in the Working Group on the Legal Development of the Madrid System for the International Registration of Marks.

15. On human rights issues, cluster members organized a dialogue between the Chairs of the United Nations human rights treaty bodies and the African human rights mechanisms, which was held in June 2012 in Ethiopia. The meeting highlighted complementarities in the promotion and protection of human rights standards.

16. On democracy and governance, cluster members assisted the African Peer Review Mechanism secretariat by facilitating and participating in the review and self-assessment processes of several countries. Consequently, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia were reviewed, bringing to 17 the number of peer-reviewed countries. Chad, the Niger and Tunisia acceded to the Mechanism during the reporting period, bringing its membership to 33. In June 2012, with United Nations support, the African Union Commission launched the African governance platform, the coordinating arm of the African governance architecture. The platform facilitates information flow, exchanges, dialogue and joint action between the various African governance actors.

17. In July 2012, the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, in collaboration with the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, organized an expert group meeting on the management of diversity in Africa. The meeting contributed to increasing awareness of the importance of securing and enhancing the participation

of diverse groups, including women, young people and civil society, in processes that aim to achieve continental peace, unity and integration. The recommendations arising from the meeting fed into the eighth African Governance Forum.

18. In October 2012, the eighth African Governance Forum, on democracy, elections and the management of diversity in Africa, was jointly organized by the Economic Commission for Africa, UNDP and the African Union. It generated a rich policy-oriented and development-oriented debate on governance in Africa and contributed to the existing stock of knowledge.

19. UN-Women provided technical support to the Democratic Republic of the Congo for gender mainstreaming in its electoral processes and the creation of new laws on gender parity. In South Kivu, it raised the awareness of 50 heads of political parties, 60 journalists and 150 civil society leaders about the importance of female leadership and trained 100 female leaders and potential candidates in electoral campaign strategies, which resulted in a 35 per cent increase in the number of women included in the electoral lists. In Senegal, UN-Women provided financial and technical support to the Ministry of Women's Affairs, Children and Female Entrepreneurship in the finalization and adoption of a gender parity law. The law was implemented in time for the parliamentary elections of July 2012. Consequently, the percentage of women parliamentarians in Senegal has almost doubled from 22.7 to 42.7 per cent.

20. The United Nations Democracy Fund financially supported 29 new projects by local civil society organizations working to strengthen democracy. The Fund supported the strengthening of legal frameworks for access to information in sub-Saharan Africa, democratic dialogue and social cohesion in Côte d'Ivoire and a project fighting violence and discrimination in Djibouti. It also supported citizen participation in Ghana, helped to mainstream women in the democratization process in Libya and supported the engagement of young people and civil society in public dialogue in North Africa. Other projects included promoting political tolerance in Malawi, advancing women in local governance in Mozambique and facilitating the participation of women in local budgetary processes in the Niger. The Fund helped to build social movements in Sierra Leone and strengthen the capacity of Sierra Leonean parliamentarians. The projects enabled greater participation and engagement by all groups in decision-making and governance.

C. Peace and security

21. The peace and security cluster, co-chaired by the United Nations Office to the African Union on behalf of the Department of Political Affairs of the Secretariat and the African Union Peace and Security Council, comprises three subclusters: the peace and security architecture of the African Union, post-conflict reconstruction and development, and human rights, justice and reconciliation.

22. During the reporting period, the United Nations Office to the African Union facilitated the organization of two high-level meetings of the United Nations-African Union Joint Task Force on Peace and Security to review the situations in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali and Somalia.

23. Under the peace and security architecture of the African Union subcluster, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the Secretariat supported the conduct of

a training needs assessment of the African Standby Force. The exercise aimed to build the Force's police and civilian capacities to enhance its multidimensional character and attain full operational capability by 2015. The Department continued to assist the African Union in planning, launching and managing peacekeeping operations, including in relation to the deployment of an international military force to Mali in accordance with resolution 2085 (2012), and in planning and managing the African Union Mission in Somalia.

24. The United Nations Office for West Africa, the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire and the United Nations Mission in Liberia are promoting the development of a subregional strategy to address cross-border movements of armed groups and weapons, in line with Security Council resolutions 2000 (2011) and 2066 (2012).

25. The Department of Political Affairs provided support to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in developing a subregional counter-terrorism strategy, which was endorsed by the Mediation and Security Council of ECOWAS at a ministerial-level meeting in February 2013. The United Nations Office for West Africa is also stepping up efforts to enhance subregional capacity for conflict prevention and mediation by assisting in the development of an ECOWAS mediation facilitation division in Nigeria. It worked closely with ECOWAS, the Mano River Union secretariat and the African Union to review regional political and security trends and identify ways to anticipate and coordinate collective responses to peace and security challenges.

26. UNODC expanded its cooperation with the regional economic communities and the NEPAD Agency through its regional programme for Eastern Africa for the period 2009-2012 and its regional programme for West Africa for the period 2010-2014. It supported national counterparts in Kenya, Mauritius and Seychelles to prosecute and detain suspected pirates and to develop anti-piracy communication strategies. At the request of Ethiopia, UNODC initiated the development of a national integrated programme to combat drug trafficking and organized crime in the country.

27. UN-Women worked to promote women's leadership in peace and security by strengthening the advocacy skills of relevant civil society groups and raising the awareness of government authorities. In Mali, it engaged more than 1,000 women in preparing statements on the importance of women's participation in mediation and negotiation processes.

28. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations remained engaged with the African Union and ECOWAS to support the transition of Côte d'Ivoire to sustainable peace, security and economic recovery. It continued to provide proactive support to the initiatives of member States of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region and the Southern African Development Community. It developed a multi-year strategic partnership on security sector reform, bringing together the African Union, the United Nations and the European Union. A policy framework on security sector reform was adopted at the twentieth ordinary session of the summit of the African Union, held in January 2013.

29. The Department continued to support efforts aimed at building national police capacity to tackle sexual violence. A total of 140 police officers from 30 African Member States were trained and certified through a training-of-trainers course on

preventing and investigating sexual and gender-based violence in post-conflict societies.

30. In November 2012, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs conducted an experience-sharing and consultation meeting in Kenya that brought together the various regional economic communities. The Office continued to provide technical support to African entities through information management and advice to establish pooled fund mechanisms for preparedness and recovery activities at the country and regional levels, as requested by the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development. The Office helped Governments and regional economic communities in resilience planning and programming and with the design of information-sharing platforms. It also facilitated the development of the Sahel Resilience Strategy and the United Nations strategic review in Somalia.

31. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) has been involved in addressing the humanitarian crisis in the Sahel, in particular regarding access to nutrition, hygiene, health, protection, water and immunization. The Sahel Resilience Strategy incorporated those aspects to strengthen community capacity to deal with the nutrition crisis. Furthermore, its humanitarian policy and disaster risk reduction strategy tackled impacts on children and women.

32. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) helped to repatriate 236,000 refugees, return some 1.7 million internally displaced persons and submitted 22,000 Africans for resettlement (of whom 10,200 resettled in Australia, Canada, Sweden and the United States of America). UNHCR also accelerated the implementation of its comprehensive strategies to bring to a close the protracted Angolan, Liberian and Rwandan refugee situations.

33. The distribution by UNHCR of 70,000 emergency assistance packages containing kitchen sets, sleeping mats and water purification tablets benefited more than 400,000 people in Mogadishu and southern Somalia. In Liberia, UNHCR extended protection and assistance to 224,000 Ivorian refugees. Post-distribution monitoring showed that more than 96 per cent of the items reached the intended beneficiaries.

34. UNODC, together with the World Customs Organization, assisted West African countries to combat illicit trafficking under the framework of the Airport Communication Project and the Global Container Control Programme. Joint airport interdiction task forces were installed in Cape Verde, Mali, Senegal and Togo and proved instrumental in making drug seizures. UNODC, together with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the United Nations Office for West Africa and the International Criminal Police Organization, supported the implementation of the West Africa Coast Initiative in Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone to improve cooperation and intelligence gathering and to advocate stronger international action against illicit trafficking in the region.

D. Agriculture, food security and rural development

35. The agriculture, food security and rural development cluster is co-chaired by the African Union Commission and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

36. During the reporting period, the cluster provided coordinated and effective support to the agriculture, food and nutrition security and rural development agenda of the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Agency, the regional economic communities and African countries. The cluster achieved substantial results in implementing the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme and supporting Africa's agricultural sector, including through the strengthening of country ownership and leadership, the mobilization of political, financial and technical support and the engagement of diverse regional and national actors.

37. UNDP collaborated with the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme to facilitate investments for smallholder farmers and small- and medium-sized enterprises in an effort to boost private-sector investment in Africa's agriculture, including by developing private-sector guidelines for national and subregional investment plans. UNDP provided support in conducting business meetings, signing compacts and formulating post-compact investment plans, undertaking technical reviews of the investment plans and preparing applications for funding under the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme. United Nations agencies supported 24 countries in developing national agriculture and food security investment plans based on the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, which helped to secure $430 million in funding for 11 countries to implement the plans. In June 2012, Burundi, the Gambia, Malawi, Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania were selected to receive grants totalling $160.5 million from the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme.

38. Since 2008, the World Bank has administered a multi-donor trust fund in the amount of $31 million for the implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, for which the disbursement end date has been extended to June 2016. It has also administered two interrelated trust funds in support of regional institutions responsible for agricultural research under the fourth pillar of the Programme: the Forum for Agriculture Research in Africa and the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa. In February 2013, the trust fund of the former increased from $26 million to $31 million. In July 2012, an additional $6.5 million in funds was committed to the latter.

39. UNICEF, in collaboration with the African Union Commission, promoted an initiative to raise awareness of the importance of the first 1,000 days of a child's life, so as to combat problems such as stunting, during the commemoration in October 2012 of the third Africa Day for Food and Nutrition Security. UNICEF facilitated discussions on stunting and undernutrition and increased political awareness of the importance of food and nutrition security.

40. The World Bank extended the West Africa Agricultural Productivity Programme to nine West African countries to establish regional centres of excellence in agricultural research and technology dissemination. The Bank's support in Burkina Faso enabled an additional 215,000 farmers to receive agricultural extension and research services. In the United Republic of Tanzania, 2 million additional households directly benefited from access to critical agricultural inputs. Senegal released 20 improved varieties of maize, sorghum and millet and is also disseminating new technology for bread production, resulting in significant cost savings. ECOWAS adopted common regulations for the registration of genetic materials and pesticides and helped seven Sahelian countries to establish a new

locust early warning and response system. The Bank supported Ghana and Guinea-Bissau in sustainable management of regional fisheries, which increased local fisheries revenue.

41. IAEA, in partnership with FAO, developed nuclear techniques that proved successful in fighting rinderpest, tsetse and trypanosomosis, thereby increasing agricultural and animal productivity and insect and pest control. The techniques also contributed to increasing agricultural productivity. To improve the productivity of cocoa farms, the Common Fund for Commodities supported capacity-building projects on integrated pest management in several African countries. The project strengthened in-country and regional capacity for pest surveillance to prevent the spread of pests and pathogens and reduced crop losses.

42. FAO, UNDP and the World Bank collaborated to help countries and regional economic communities to design effective programmes for climate-smart agriculture within the context of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme. Key stakeholders discussed best practices, challenges and opportunities in relation to climate-smart agriculture and coordinated to ensure synergy in tackling challenges.

43. Through the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel Initiative, FAO, the Economic Commission for Africa and the World Bank collaborated to support countries in addressing desertification and environmental degradation through interrelated, mutually reinforcing and coordinated actions focused on poverty reduction, integrated natural resource management, sustainable land management, resource mapping, biodiversity, soil and water. They also supported the elaboration of regional integrated financing strategies, national components and the development of an overall harmonized strategy. Five countries developed national strategies through stakeholder consultations.

44. Through the Accelerated Agribusiness and Agro-industries Development Initiative, UNIDO promoted the development of agribusiness and agro-industries in Africa through selected value chain analysis. In 2012, it co-organized a workshop in Benin to enable 200 young entrepreneurs from 14 African countries to exchange best practices on agribusiness entrepreneurship and value chain development. Furthermore, in November 2012, UNIDO concluded a memorandum of understanding with Louis Dreyfus Commodities with the aim of enhancing the productivity and profitability of agribusinesses in Africa and to develop three to five projects in which joint action could directly affect rural communities.

45. The Common Fund for Commodities supported a capacity-building project on price risk management strategies for cocoa farmers in Africa. Smallholder farmers from Cameroon, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Togo learned about costs, negative impacts and mitigation measures with regard to cocoa price volatility in an effort to improve income predictability and production management. In East Africa, the Common Fund supported a project to establish demand-driven pilot rice value chains involving smallholder farmers, rice millers, commercial farmers, finance institutions and input providers. The project improved the food security and living standards of rice producers in Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania. In North Africa, the Common Fund supported the development of a pilot nursery to serve as a centre of excellence for the demonstration of innovative propagation techniques and modern technologies in olive production.

E. Industry, trade and market access

46. The cluster, co-chaired by the African Union Commission and UNIDO, supported African regional and subregional organizations in building productive capacity for trade, market access and continent-wide sustainable industrialization.

47. The Standards and Trade Development Facility of the World Bank, the World Health Organization, FAO, the World Organization for Animal Health and the World Trade Organization (WTO) continued to support coordination mechanisms and capacity-building with regard to sanitary and phytosanitary measures. In September 2012, the African Union Commission and the Facility jointly organized a meeting on sanitary and phytosanitary coordination and capacity-building in Africa. The WTO technical cooperation programme trained more than 2,000 people from July to December 2012 to enhance their human and institutional capacity in relation to multilateral trade issues. WTO also increased its support to the African Group in Geneva, which has become a main pillar for the formulation of trade policy in Africa, in particular in preparation for the Ninth WTO Ministerial Conference, in 2013.

48. WTO, in collaboration with the other partner United Nations agencies, helped to strengthen trade institutions and implement priority national projects in agriculture, trade facilitation, export promotion and productive capacity-building through the Enhanced Integrated Framework. As at December 2012, contributions to the EIF Trust Fund had reached $178 million. Projects improved compliance with standards and facilitated value addition, export growth and income generation for the poor. Project examples include private-sector collaboration in sesame production in Burkina Faso and institutional capacity-building in sanitary and phytosanitary standards in Burundi.

49. On capacity-building, UNCTAD developed materials for African universities on the economics of commodities production and trade. The University of Dar es Salaam used the modules as training materials for its international trade programme and graduate student research. UNCTAD also provided World Integrated Trade Solution/Trade Analysis and Information System training workshops to African countries and regional capacity-building workshops to the Southern African Development Community and ECOWAS on the identification, collection and classification of non-tariff measures.

50. The Transparency in Trade initiative, implemented by UNCTAD, the International Trade Centre (ITC), the World Bank and the African Development Bank, made progress in data collection and classification and measurement of non-tariff measures. UNCTAD initiated data collection in five ECOWAS member States, with indicative measurements in December 2012 estimating an increase of 1,000 database users since 2011.

51. The World Bank financed a project to improve transit time in regional corridors, reducing waiting time at the port of Mombasa, Kenya, from 19 to 14 days and reducing customs clearance time at the border between Kenya and Uganda from three days to three hours. To support regional trade integration, ITC and partner United Nations agencies implemented product packaging traceability technology in Mozambique. The technology strengthened market access and linkages between local producers and global retail giants such as Walmart and Massmart, thus integrating Africa into the global market.

52. A joint ITC and Southern African Development Community supply chain project in Malawi linked low-income farmers to formal buyers, including supermarkets and hotels, improving product supply, delivery and quality. ITC helped high-fashion houses and distributors to source parts of their collections from artisans in Burkina Faso, Ghana and Kenya, creating more than 1,100 regular jobs and 7,000 intermittent jobs. ITC strengthened the pineapple export value chain in several West African countries, supporting more than 200 small- and medium-sized enterprises. Enterprises and stakeholders acquired in excess of $8 million for the initiative. Of the more than 10,000 beneficiaries of the programme, 80 per cent were women.

53. The World Tourism Organization promoted sustainable tourism in several African countries by organizing training sessions on handicraft production, guiding techniques and tourism management. Those efforts enabled local communities to design and organize cultural tours.

54. UNIDO, together with the African Union Commission, established a comprehensive business plan for the African pharmaceutical industry to enable the independent production of important medicines on the continent. UNIDO also supported the transfer of soya bean processing technology from Japan to Eastern and Southern Africa, resulting in the production of high-protein soya bean products in Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

55. Through a conference on economic diversification and manufacturing in Africa, held in Addis Ababa in June 2012, UNIDO promoted investment in Africa's pharmaceutical and agribusiness industries. This strengthened international cooperation between emerging economies and African countries, in particular in resource mobilization and project implementation.

F. Environment, population and urbanization

56. The cluster continued to tackle challenges relating to environmental degradation, population growth and movement of people, the rapid growth of cities and the dearth of demographic statistics.

57. The cluster assisted in training Africa's negotiators for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. As part of the African regional preparatory process for the Conference, the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, in collaboration with the Economic Commission for Africa, UNDP, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the African Union Commission and the African Development Bank, organized events on the institutional framework for sustainable development (integrating the three pillars), financing sustainable development and the transition towards a green economy in Africa, and promoting inclusive green growth and building a green economy as a means of achieving sustainable development, in addition to an Africa Day high-level round table. Those events enabled Africa and its partners to identify sustainable development challenges and ultimately contributed to the outcome document of the Conference.

58. UNCTAD provided policy recommendations ahead of the Conference through the *Economic Development in Africa Report 2012: Structural Transformation and Sustainable Development in Africa*. It recommended decoupling natural resource use and environmental impacts from the economic growth process. In addition,

UNCTAD provided capacity-building for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and national implementation plans in least developed countries of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa.

59. As the secretariat of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN), UNEP continued to support AMCEN as part of the environment initiative of NEPAD. In collaboration with the Government of Mozambique and other partners, UNEP organized the seventh meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Amended Nairobi Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean. UNEP also launched the report *SIDS-focused Green Economy: An Analysis of Challenges and Opportunities*, which provided an analysis of small-scale fisheries and other development sectors in small island developing States. UNEP also initiated a water scheme in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to protect the Lukaya river basin, which supplies safe drinking water to almost 380,000 residents.

60. In March 2013, a high-level meeting on national drought policy was organized under the auspices of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, the World Meteorological Organization, FAO, regional organizations and key national agencies. The meeting provided Governments and private-sector entities with practical, science-based strategies to tackle drought, including proactive mitigation and risk management strategies. IMO provided national and regional training courses and workshops on marine pollution prevention and protection of the marine environment in several African countries.

61. The World Bank continued to build institutional capacity with regard to collaborative management of the transboundary natural resources of the Lake Victoria basin. The Bank provided support on watershed management and erosion in Nigeria and helped to improve water sources for 1.8 million additional people in Kenyan urban areas.

62. The United Nations University (UNU) continued to support the action plan of the environment initiative of NEPAD through the UNU Institute of Advanced Studies, which promoted the expansion and capacity development of regional centres of expertise in Africa as networks for promoting education for sustainable development. Five new African centres were acknowledged in November 2012, bringing their number to 22 (of 116).

63. The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), with the cluster members, supported the development of an African programme on accelerated implementation of civil registration and vital statistics, supporting the African integration agenda and protecting children and women by establishing identity and proof of age.

64. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) provided financial support, technical expertise and logistical assistance to the Economic Community of Central African States to initiate a regional consultative process for Central Africa. The initiative fostered inter-State dialogue and intraregional cooperation on migration management for policy coherence and regional integration in Central Africa. IOM provided technical support to ECOWAS member States through the Migration Dialogue for West Africa, which facilitates the implementation in West Africa of the ECOWAS Common Approach on Migration and Development and creates a proactive interface between national, regional and international actors.

65. The United Nations Human Settlements Programme continued to promote sustainable urbanization by supporting the development of the NEPAD cities programme in partnership with the NEPAD Agency and the city of Durban, South Africa, to encourage sustainable NEPAD cities that will deliver on the NEPAD goals. Furthermore, it supported local authorities in 18 African countries to develop capacity to address crime and delinquency affecting the vulnerable and destroying the basis of local economic development. Urban security was strengthened in Burkina Faso, while the safety and security of women and girls was enhanced in Egypt and Morocco. Safety and security audits were developed in Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea and Kenya. An African road map on urban safety and security and an action plan for reducing delinquency and disorder in Western and Central Africa were also developed.

G. Social and human development

66. The social and human development cluster has progressively aligned its programme of work with NEPAD priorities.

67. Through the Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy, IAEA and the World Health Organization strengthened cancer control in Africa. The Programme helped 22 African countries by providing an evaluation of their readiness to implement cancer control programmes, completing an assessment of their national cancer burdens and providing recommendations on developing cancer control capacity.

68. IAEA also strengthened radiotherapy and nuclear medicine centres by procuring equipment and expert services and enabling the long-term training of radiation oncologists, medical physicists, nuclear medicine physicians and related professionals. From May 2012 to January 2013, IAEA awarded 302 fellowships and facilitated 84 scientific visits. During the same period, 75 training courses were held, with a total of 1,022 participants.

69. UNFPA continued to support the Campaign on Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality in Africa, such as through a high-level event at the twentieth ordinary session of the summit of the African Union that celebrated the reduction of maternal mortality in Africa and saw renewed commitments to intensification of actions to reduce maternal and newborn morbidity and mortality on the continent. To tackle the issue of unattended births, efforts were made to train skilled practitioners. Cameroon is now opening eight midwifery schools and completing the training of a second wave of more than 200 students, while Sierra Leone has introduced free medical services for pregnant women and their babies.

70. The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS worked closely with the African Union Commission and the NEPAD Agency to develop a road map on shared responsibility and global solidarity for AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria response in Africa for the period 2012-2015. To generate support, a high-level event was convened in September 2012 entitled "Shared responsibility and global solidarity: leveraging the AIDS response for Africa's sustainable development". The event generated political impetus towards the achievement by 2015 of the targets and commitments made in the Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS: Intensifying Our Efforts to Eliminate HIV and AIDS, adopted in June 2011.

71. The World Bank supported the construction and renovation of health facilities in African countries. In particular, 195 health facilities were built and renovated in Ethiopia, providing 30 million additional people with access to basic health, nutrition and population services. Some 8 million poor individuals are now receiving social safety net benefits.

72. IOM provided technical and logistical support to the African Union to make operational the Ouagadougou Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings, Especially Women and Children. With this support, the Union launched, in Gabon in December 2012, an initiative against trafficking with the goal of increasing awareness of human trafficking in all regions of Africa. The International Labour Organization (ILO) prepared a discussion paper on enhancing the capacity of labour market institutions in Africa to meet current and future challenges and a compendium of good practices in the implementation of the Plan of Action for Promotion of Employment and Poverty Alleviation. These will feed into the ninth session of the African Union Labour and Social Affairs Commission, to be held in April 2013.

73. UNDP and the NEPAD Agency supported several African countries in preparing national capacity development profiles and identifying capacity constraints and also recommended interventions to tackle institutional and systemic challenges.

H. Science and technology

74. The support of the science and technology cluster focuses on the implementation of the NEPAD science and technology consolidated plan of action, which is built on the three interrelated pillars of capacity-building, knowledge production and technological innovation. The cluster members continued supporting the efforts of African countries to transform their economies into knowledge-based economies.

75. ITU continued to collaborate with the African Union in the implementation of the African Observatory for Science, Technology and Innovation through a feasibility study for a data collection platform and network design to promote a digital economy with cascading benefits to other sectors of African society.

76. To ensure that information and communications technology skills and knowledge reach primary and secondary school pupils, ITU continued to support the NEPAD e-Schools initiative with the aim of connecting all African primary and secondary schools to the Internet by the end of 2013. This enabled students to function in the emerging information society and knowledge economy, enhanced teaching and learning methods and facilitated the efficient management and administration of the schools. Under the "Connect a School, Connect a Community" initiative in the Gambia, Lesotho, the Niger, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania, schoolchildren at 71 sites continued to receive information and communications technology materials and courses.

77. To improve the quality of reporting on science to the public and its impact on the livelihood of African citizens, the Economic Commission for Africa collaborated with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the African Union Commission to implement a series of workshops for science

journalists and launch a network of science journalists (the African Technology Development and Transfer Network).

78. The UNU Maastricht Economic and Social Research and Training Centre on Innovation and Technology supported the African Union and NEPAD in providing training for the second phase of the African Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators Initiative. A new round of surveys was completed, with the results validated at a workshop in Cairo in February 2013. The data and related analysis will contribute to the preparation of the next edition of the African Innovation Outlook in 2013.

I. Communication, advocacy and outreach

79. The advocacy and communications cluster, co-chaired by the African Union Commission and the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, continued to increase advocacy and mobilization for NEPAD through the Regional Coordination Mechanism process, to enhance the existing dialogue between the African Union/United Nations system and the community of media reporting on Africa and to increase the technical capacity of the NEPAD communication team.

80. The Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, in collaboration with the Economic Commission for Africa and the NEPAD Agency, facilitated the preparation and publication of *Africa's Decade of Change: Reflections on 10 Years of NEPAD* to mark the tenth anniversary of NEPAD. The cluster also supported the publication of a quarterly newsletter on intra-cluster activities to enhance communication within the Regional Coordination Mechanism process. The Commission strengthened the communication capacity of the NEPAD Agency through team restructuring, the secondment of short-term staff members and the production of advocacy tools.

81. The cluster trained media professionals and communications officers from NEPAD countries through a webcast funded by the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation and prepared a technical manual on development reporting to provide common standards and tools for media practitioners in Africa.

82. In October 2012, the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, in partnership with the Economic Commission for Africa, the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, the NEPAD Agency and the African Union Commission, organized a week devoted to NEPAD and Africa at United Nations Headquarters, during which a series of events were held, including panel discussions and briefings for Member States and the press. Publications on Africa's development were launched to increase awareness and improve international understanding and mobilization for development.

83. ILO helped to strengthen the capacity and reporting skills of African journalists through the Media for Labour Rights Prize, established by the International Training Centre. ILO also supported the creation of a database of journalists working in Africa or covering African issues and contributed to a technical review of a manual on reporting about NEPAD issues.

84. The Department of Public Information continued to support NEPAD by arranging and facilitating press briefings and interviews for the Chief Executive Officer of the NEPAD Agency and by providing media support and a press briefing

by the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa and UNIDO in November 2012 to commemorate Africa Industrialization Day. It also prepared feature articles on NEPAD and other African development issues in major media in Africa and around the world. In the last eight months of 2012, its feature articles were published 489 times in scores of different media worldwide. By the end of December 2012, the English-language Africa Renewal Twitter account had more than 22,700 people and organizations following its tweets, while the French-language version had 9,160 followers.

85. ITU played a crucial role in advocating Africa's development by leveraging information and communications technology access and facilitating the mobilization of technical, human and financial resources for implementation. It also worked to narrow the digital divide by promoting the right of everyone to communicate through access to infrastructure and information and communication services.

86. In September 2012, the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa concluded a General Assembly-led process to establish a United Nations monitoring mechanism to review commitments made towards Africa's development, as called for at the high-level meeting on Africa's development needs held in 2008. The monitoring mechanism, based on the principles of mutual accountability and partnership, will promote enhanced mobilization of support and transparency in the delivery of commitments made towards Africa's development.

III. Policy issues in the implementation of the New Partnership

A. Strengthening of the cluster system and enhanced United Nations/ African Union cooperation

87. During the reporting period, the United Nations system strengthened its support for the implementation of NEPAD and the 10-year capacity-building programme for the African Union by handing over to the Union the joint work programme for the implementation of the programme in June 2012.

88. The nine clusters of the Regional Coordination Mechanism continued to support the African Union Commission in the servicing of Union summits, the implementation of various programmes for Africa's development, the provision of effective technical support, capacity-building and a forum for consensus-building and advocacy, and the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues such as gender and employment in their work. The clusters prepared business plans and developed benchmarks to monitor progress in the implementation of NEPAD priorities. The mechanism is now administered jointly by the Union and the United Nations.

89. A joint subregional coordination mechanism was established for Eastern and Southern Africa. With technical support from the Economic Commission for Africa, the mechanism developed a business plan in line with the decision of the regional economic communities in the subregion to facilitate a free trade area across Eastern and Southern Africa.

90. UN-Women provided technical and financial support for participatory gender audits for agencies participating in the governance and social development clusters. The audits strengthened capacity to mainstream gender equality in the governance and social development areas of NEPAD work.

91. In July 2012, UNEP and the Regional Coordination Mechanism secretariat held a two-day meeting to discuss resource mobilization strategies for the African Union and NEPAD. The meeting identified several possibilities for strengthening and building synergies and linkages between clusters, including strengthening intra-cluster and inter-cluster coordination among United Nations agencies in developing and implementing their cluster activities.

B. Support for the mobilization of financial resources for the implementation of the New Partnership

92. In the light of the emphasis by African leaders on domestic resource mobilization as a core development finance option, the Economic Commission for Africa and the NEPAD Agency jointly prepared a draft research report on ways and means of mobilizing domestic resources for implementing national and regional NEPAD programmes and projects. Under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme Trust Fund, the World Bank provided $3.5 million in budget support.

93. To achieve macroeconomic and financial stability in African countries, the International Monetary Fund provided financial support through a range of financing facilities, including concessional loans disbursed under the Poverty Reduction and Growth Trust and grants for heavily indebted poor countries. In 2012, disbursements from the Trust reached nearly $1 billion. Debt relief under the heavily indebted poor countries and multilateral debt relief initiatives helped to reduce the debt burden of heavily indebted poor countries and released resources for poverty-reducing expenditures. To date, 36 of 39 heavily indebted poor countries, 30 of which are in sub-Saharan Africa, have qualified under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative for debt relief totalling $76 billion expressed in 2011 net present value terms. By the end of 2012, 29 countries in sub-Saharan Africa had reached the heavily indebted poor countries completion point.

94. The UNCTAD Debt Management and Financial Analysis System nearly doubled its expenditure in 2012 to $1.12 million to support African countries in strengthening their human and institutional capacity to manage debt effectively and sustainably. The direct technical assistance provided to 18 African countries by the System since May 2012 has improved external and domestic debt recording.

95. To enhance investment to Africa, the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency is expecting to issue guarantees amounting to $1.4 billion in 2013. Similarly, the Africa portfolio of the International Financial Corporation has grown steadily, the global crisis notwithstanding, with improved quality and development outcomes reaching $4.2 billion.

96. Further information on United Nations system resources provided in support of NEPAD can be found in the annex to the present report.

C. Cross-cutting issues

97. In July 2012, the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa organized, and engaged high-level policymakers in, a round-table breakfast on addressing youth unemployment as a strategy for peacebuilding, conflict prevention and resolution in

Africa. The round table raised awareness of best practices, challenges and specific measures for securing greater opportunities for the participation and engagement of young people in decision-making in local and national structures.

98. UN-Women continued to provide support for the elaboration of gender policies and plans, women's economic empowerment and efforts to end violence against women and to promote women's leadership and political participation, including in peace and security. UN-Women advocated gender mainstreaming in the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme and provided direct support for the economic empowerment of women through capacity development and support for gender-responsive economic policy management. In Ethiopia, UN-Women formed a partnership with the Women Entrepreneurs' Association to improve women's participation in specific value chains linked with the agropastoral and energy sectors. The partnership successfully renovated display centres and provided business training and start-up capital to more than 5,000 women, resulting in enhanced market entry for women's products.

99. In preparation for the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on the Status of Women, in March 2013, UN-Women supported an African ministerial meeting held in Addis Ababa that resulted in a declaration on measures to prevent and appropriately respond to violence against women. In December 2012, UNFPA supported a consultation of all regional economic communities, including the gender unit of the NEPAD secretariat, on engaging men and boys for gender equality.

100. UNICEF, in collaboration with the African Union Commission, facilitated the participation of children from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Mali, Somalia and Zambia in the third Pan-African Forum on Children, held in November 2012. During the forum, UNICEF provided input to the draft renewed call for action on the implementation of the Plan of Action towards Africa Fit for Children for 2013-2017.

D. Institutional support

101. The Economic Commission for Africa supported the NEPAD Agency in enhancing coordination with regard to NEPAD implementation through a regional dialogue in June 2012. The participants adopted the Durban Statement, forged a common understanding among key stakeholders and institutionalized a forum of NEPAD focal points that provides a mechanism for coordination.

102. The Commission continued to provide substantive, financial and logistical support to the NEPAD Agency for the organization of statutory and ad hoc events. Technical support was provided for the preparation of African common positions and to reach consensus for the Group of Eight and Group of 20 processes, respectively, and for the regional preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. The Commission supported the NEPAD Agency in responding to a joint request from Kenya and South Sudan for technical support to design, execute and mobilize resources for the South Sudan Development Initiative. FAO continued strengthening the capacity of the NEPAD Agency through the secondment of two experts to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme.

103. In December 2012, ILO and the African Union Commission signed a letter of intent to scale up the Union's workplace policy on HIV/AIDS and provide Union staff with tools and programmes to reduce their vulnerability to HIV and create a non-discriminatory workplace. ILO assisted the Union and NEPAD in its biennial follow-up on the implementation of the Plan of Action for Promotion of Employment and Poverty Alleviation in Africa by facilitating the information collection process for the fourth biennial report.

104. UNU supported the NEPAD Agency in preparing a proposal for research and policy formulation to develop a framework that takes into account the overall human well-being needs of small farmholders in Africa while harnessing the opportunities made available by modern bioenergy for equitable and sustainable energy provision.

E. Challenges and constraints

105. While progress was achieved in providing coordinated support to the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Agency and the regional economic communities through demand-driven business plans, at its thirteenth session the Regional Coordination Mechanism noted the remaining key challenges, including limited resources, varied mandates of clusters, limited communication within and between clusters and inadequate intra-cluster and inter-cluster coordination. In addition, the Mechanism lacked a monitoring approach to review and evaluate the impact of cluster activities in support of the implementation of NEPAD. As part of the solution, the Mechanism recognized the importance of systematic mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues and current priorities of the global development agenda into the clusters' work.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

106. **The United Nations system continues to provide substantial support to priority areas of NEPAD through the nine clusters of the Regional Coordination Mechanism and the funding of programmes and projects, capacity-building and institution-building, resource mobilization and advocacy, and humanitarian relief.**

107. **Through the Mechanism, United Nations entities should strengthen support for those areas identified as continuing priorities for the African Union Commission during the period 2012-2016, including agriculture and food security, infrastructure development, peace and stability and the participation of women and young people.**

108. **Given that the present report coincides with the fiftieth anniversary of the African Union (formerly the Organization of African Unity), it is timely for the United Nations system to formulate a monitoring approach to assess the impact of its support on Africa's development and, in particular, on the implementation of the commitments made by the United Nations system towards the African Union and NEPAD.**

109. **Although various policies have been adopted to promote national and regional infrastructure development in Africa, the continent's infrastructure**

deficit remains a particularly strong impediment to inclusive economic growth and poverty reduction. To overcome this, the United Nations system should strengthen its support for Africa's infrastructure development so that African countries, the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Agency and the regional economic communities continue regulatory reform processes, further mobilize domestic resources and enhance cross-border initiatives in the context of the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa.

110. **Given the importance of agriculture to food security and development on the continent, the United Nations system should strengthen its efforts to assist African countries in achieving the target of allocating 10 per cent of national budgets to agriculture, as set down in the Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa, and in exceeding the target of 6 per cent in agriculture sector growth, as set down in the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme.**

111. **To strengthen regional economic integration in Africa, United Nations entities should align the planning, programming and budget cycles of country programmes with national planning and budgeting cycles and with regional and subregional programmes. In addition, United Nations entities should provide coherent and coordinated support for building African capacity through the 10-year capacity-building programme for the African Union.**

112. **The United Nations system should also strengthen its efforts to provide coordinated, inclusive and coherent support for the implementation of the recommendations of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, including by integrating the recommendations into their work programmes and budgets. The United Nations system should, in particular, increase its support for the implementation of green growth policies in Africa, including by supporting the formulation of an investment strategy for Africa's transition towards a green economy.**

113. **In addition, the United Nations system should adopt a coordinated and coherent strategy to ensure that NEPAD priorities are fully reflected in the post-2015 development agenda, in particular in the areas of good governance and the nexus between peace, security and development. It is equally important for the United Nations system to redouble its efforts to ensure that Africa attains the Millennium Development Goals by 2015.**

114. **In line with General Assembly resolution 66/287, the United Nations system should take all measures necessary to strengthen the United Nations Inter-agency Task Force on Africa to ensure further coherence and an integrated approach for United Nations support for Africa, including in following up on the implementation of all global summit and conference outcomes relating to Africa.**

Annex

United Nations system support for Africa: financial and staff resources devoted to Africa, 2010-2012

Entity	Type of support	Resources (thousands of United States dollars)			Africa's share of resources (percentage)		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Common Fund for Commodities	Project commitments	3 416	12 098	8 587	10.0		
Department of Economic and Social Affairs/Office for Economic and Social Council Support and Coordination	Total financial support	284	109				
Department of Public Information	Financial and staff resources	1 162	1 152	1 146	100	100	100
Economic Commission for Africa	Total regular budget allotment under section 18	60 505	50 053	52 246			
	Total regular budget allotment under section 11	924	542	540			
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Total field programme	297 800	319 500	292 900	33	34	38
	Emergency assistance	149 600	174 000	197 600	37	43	59
	Technical cooperation	148 200	145 500	95 300	30	28	23
International Atomic Energy Agency[a]	Technical cooperation fund	27 366	16 694	22 549			
	Extrabudgetary	2 644	2 972	4 771			
	Total technical cooperation programme	30 011	19 667	27 320	26.3	25.1	29.9
International Labour Organization	Regular budget	34 194	34 194	39 560	9.4	9.4	9.2
	Portion of staff resources devoted to Africa (regular budget)	23 951	23 951	27 050	9.6	9.6	9.0
International Maritime Organization	Financial resources	4 089	5 685	6 511			
	Staff resources (number of people)	21	24	24			
International Monetary Fund	Poverty Reduction and Growth Trust loans	806 600	1 179 900	995 200			
	Heavily indebted poor countries grants[b]	1 102 900	8 000	60 500			
	IMF debt relief delivered to sub-Saharan Africa		6 218 000	6 598 000			
International Telecommunication Union	Financial support	1 797	4 239	3 323	24	24	25
International Trade Centre	Financial resources	13 166	17 319	11 095[c]	37.7	41.1	53
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	Support to African Union	66 595	66 595				
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	Budgeted contributions	74 369	81 688	90 019			
	Number of field-based staff[d]	949	815	861			

Entity	*Type of support*	*Resources (thousands of United States dollars)*			*Africa's share of resources (percentage)*		
		2010	*2011*	*2012*	*2010*	*2011*	*2012*
Office of the Special Adviser on Africa[e]	Financial resources	4 303	4 275	4 275	100	100	100
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	Budgeted expenditure	1 878 000	1 936 000		36	40	
	Number of staff members	6 319	6 877		48	50	
Peacebuilding Support Office	Peacebuilding Fund (grants to strategic project interventions)	89 360	80 607		86.3	86.4	
United Nations Children's Fund	Financial resources to sub-Saharan Africa	1 577 176	1 870 867		55	53	
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	Expenditures for Africa	7 551	9 188	9 426	19.3	23.5	27.4
United Nations Democracy Fund	Project funding		4 600	5 885			
United Nations Development Programme	Financial contributions through Regional Programme		617	650			
	Financial contributions multi-donor trust fund		1 600	1 300			
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women	Financial resources	40 189	50 968	63 576	20	23	22
United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)	Expenditures for Africa	21 681	19 787		10	9	
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime	Total financial expenditure	39 428	42 734	50 843	24	24	25
United Nations Office for Partnerships[f]	Expenditure			22 380			
United Nations Population Fund	Country programme expenditures	126 200	132 200		44.2	45.8	
	Number of staff members	891	995		40.9	43.6	
United Nations University	Financial resources (total estimation)	300	300				
World Bank				546 500			
World Tourism Organization	Total (regular programme)	15 354	15 917		1.4	0.9	
World Trade Organization/ Standards and Trade Development Facility		1 629	1 216	1 928	47	28	38

(Footnotes on following page)

Sources: Agencies, departments, programmes, funds and organizations of the United Nations system.

Note: Data were included in the table on the basis of available information received from the United Nations system. Figures are estimates or provisional, as indicated by relevant agencies.

[a] Since 2011, IAEA programmes are budgeted in euros. The euro/United States dollar conversion rate applied is 0.774 for 2011 and 0.754 for 2012.

[b] Includes interim assistance and/or disbursement at completion point.

[c] The relative drop in assistance to Africa for 2012 compared with 2011 is because the Programme for Building African Capacity for Trade, funded by the Canadian International Development Agency, is ending. The figures are expected to rise in 2013-2014 as soon as the successor programme is operational.

[d] The figures provided here are for field-based staff.

[e] Just as any office or department of the Secretariat, the budget of the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa is calculated biennially. Data for 2012 are half of the appropriation for the current biennium.

[f] United Nations Foundation spending channelled to United Nations agencies through the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships, which is part of the United Nations Office for Partnerships.